

REMARKS

Claims 5-10, 12, 14-20, 37-40, 44-47, 49, 50, 52-54 and 58-70 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1-4, 11, 13, 21-36, 41-43, 48, 51 and 55-57 have been cancelled. Claims 5, 8, 9, 12, 37, 39, 44, 47, 49, 50, 52 and 68-70 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 11, 13, 21-23, 26-31, 34-36, 41-43, 48 and 55-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tiedemann, Jr. ("Tiedemann"), (U.S. Pat. No. 5,926,470). Claims 1, 2, 11, 13, 21-23, 26-31, 34-36, 41-43, 48 and 55-57 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 4, 24, 25, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiedemann, in view of Bertacchi (U.S. Pat. No. 5,903,840). Claims 3, 4, 24, 25, 32 and 33 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 14-20, 53-54 and 58-70 are allowed.

Claims 5-12, 37-40, 44-47, 49-50 and 52 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 5 depended from Claim 3, which depended from Claim 1. Claim 5 has been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claims 1 and 3 and is thus believed to be allowable. Claims 6 and 7 depend from Claim 5.

Claim 8 depended from Claim 3, which depended from Claim 1. Claim 8 has been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claims 1 and 3 and is thus believed to be allowable.

Claims 9 and 12 depended from Claim 1. Claims 9 and 12 have each been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claim 1 and are thus believed to be allowable. Claim 10 depends from Claim 9.

Claims 14-20 are allowed.

Claims 37 and 39 depended from Claim 35 which depended from Claim 34. Claims 37 and 39 have each been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claims 34 and 35 and are thus believed to be allowable. Claim 38 depends from Claim 37. Claim 40 depends from Claim 39.

Claim 44 depended from Claim 43 which depended from Claim 35, which depended from Claim 34. Claim 44 has been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claims 34, 35 and 43 and is thus believed to be allowable. Claims 45 and 46 depend from Claim 44.

Claims 47, 49, 50 and 52 depended from Claim 34. Claims 47, 49, 50 and 52 have each been amended to include the limitations of Claim 34 and are thus believed to be allowable.

Claims 53, 54 and 58-70 are allowed.

Claims 68-70 have been amended to correct dependencies and to correct an antecedent basis issue.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

Dated: September 13, 2004

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg